

REMARKS

Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for considering the present application. In the Final Office Action dated August 27, 2003, claims 1-20 are pending in the application. Claims 19 and 20 have been withdrawn from consideration. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner for reconsideration of the rejections set forth in the Office Action.

Claims 1-3, 5-6, and 12-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by *Mitra* (5,478,248). Applicants have amended claim 1 to clarify that the back shell has guide channels disposed within a first outside surface that the back shell is coupled to the flex circuit. Also clarified is the housing is now defined as having longitudinal sides and lateral sides defining an outer perimeter of the housing, said housing having guide arms extending from the longitudinal sides outward from the circuit board. The guide arms are sized to be received within the guide channels to align the back shell and housing during assembly. By placing the guide channels and the guide arms on the outside or perimeter surface, the assembly may be easily effectuated using the tools set forth in the application.

The *Mitra* reference does not teach or suggest the use of guide channels on the lateral perimeter surfaces of a back shell and a housing having guide arms on the outside surface thereof. The *Mitra* reference does not teach or suggest the use of a flex circuit. Although a cavity 21 is illustrated in Fig. 1 of *Mitra*, the channel is not formed on the outside surface thereof. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner for a reconsideration of claim 1.

With respect to claim 17, two back shells are recited. The back shells have a third carrier board and a fourth carrier board fixedly coupled thereto. A housing having guide arms that extend therefrom is sized to be received within the guide channels of the first and second back shells. A first carrier board is fixedly coupled to the circuit board and a second carrier board is also fixedly coupled to the circuit board. Applicants respectfully submit that only two circuit boards 5 and 14 are shown in Fig. 1. Two back shells and two carrier boards are also not illustrated. Claim 17 has been clarified in that the housing is defined as fixedly coupled to the first carrier board and the second carrier board so that the housing is indirectly coupled to the circuit board. Also, claim 17 now discussed that upon assembly the first carrier board is electrically coupled to the third carrier board and the second carrier board is electrically coupled to the fourth carrier board. Thus, several features of claim 17 are not found in the *Mitra* reference. Nor, are these features suggested in the *Mitra* reference. Applicants therefore respectfully request the Examiner for a reconsideration of claim 17. For the same reasons set forth above, applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider claims 2, 3, 5, 6, and 12-16.

Claim 4 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Mitra* (5,478,248). Applicants respectfully traverse. As mentioned above, claim 1, from which claim 4 ultimately depends, has been amended to include several limitations. Applicants respectfully submit that the cup shape retraction features are not taught or suggested in the *Mitra* reference. In fact, because two circuit boards are illustrated, applicants respectfully submit that no retraction features are provided since the circuit boards act to retract each of the connector portions.

Claims 7-11 and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Mitra* in view of *Mouissie* (4,169,642). Applicants respectfully traverse. As mentioned above, the *Mitra* reference fails to teach or suggest several elements in claim 1 from which claims 7-11 ultimately depend. The *Mitra* reference also fails to teach several elements of claim 17 from which claim 18 depends. Although the *Mouissie* reference teaches a flex circuit, the *Mouissie* reference fails to teach or suggest the missing elements of the *Mitra* reference described above. Applicants therefore respectfully request the Examiner for a reconsideration of claims 7-11 and 18.

In light of the above amendments and remarks, applicants submit that all rejections are now overcome. The applicants have added no new material to the application by these amendments. The application is now in condition for allowance and expeditious notice thereof is earnestly solicited. Should the Examiner have any questions or comments which would place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is respectfully requested to call the undersigned attorney.

Please charge any fees required in the filing of this amendment to Deposit Account 502401.

Respectfully submitted,
ARTZ & ARTZ, P.C.

By: 

Kevin G. Mierzwa
Reg. No. 38,049
28333 Telegraph Road
Suite 250
Southfield, MI 48034
(248) 223-9500

Date: 11-19-03